UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/683,489	01/07/2002	Daniel M. Snyder	120.0001	2803

27997 7590 10/12/2006

PRIEST & GOLDSTEIN PLLC
5015 SOUTHPARK DRIVE
SUITE 230
DURHAM, NC 27713-7736

EXAMINER	
RATHINASAMY, PALANI P	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3622	

DATE MAILED: 10/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/683,489	SNYDER, DANIEL M.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Palani P. Rathinasamy	3622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) 1-36 is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 March 2002 is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/12/2002.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. **Claims 15 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.** Applicant teaches of the background having a "coloration" that presents a "consistent and visually uninterrupted" backdrop. Consistent and uninterrupted would have different meanings to different people who are skilled in the art. Therefore, the claims are indefinite and unclear.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-4, 8-12, 14-19, 22-29, 30, and 35-36 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants Admitted Prior Art in view of Loban et al. (US#5612741).** Applicant discusses that it is "common" for backdrops at press conferences to have "team or organizational logos" as well as "sponsor logos" [section 0003]. Applicant states that the problem with the current system is that they "are static and do not change during the course of an interview" [section 0002]. Loban et al.

teaches of a video billboard that can be used to display messages of multiple advertisers that can be controlled electronically without having to be physically updated [abstract, background of the invention]. Loban et al. explains the difficulty of changing static advertisements [col 1, lines 10-15] and why dynamic advertisements solve this problem.

5. Regarding claims 1,16, 30 and 35-36, applicant teaches of generating a set of video signals (consisting of advertisements or logs) that are displayed on a video display. At some point later, the video display changes to display a second set of video signals (advertisements or logs) that are different from the first. At some point later, the video display changes to display a second set of video signals (advertisements or logos) that are different from the first. Loban et al. teaches of a billboard that displays advertisements on a video screen and can be electronically updated [col 1, lines 15-16]. Therefore, it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to run the press conference as admitted by applicant in a dynamic method taught by Loban et al. so as to show multiple advertisements.

6. Regarding claims 3 and 18, applicant teaches of using the video source to display "replays of a portion of a game." Loban et al. teaches that it is common for electronic displays that are used for advertisements to also show instant replays, customer information, etc. [col 1, lines 20-23].

7. Regarding claims 4, 12, 19 and 26-27, applicant teaches of using a "controller to interact" with the display unit. Loban et al teaches of a "remote control unit (RCU)" that allows one to operate the billboard [col 3, lines 45-50].

8. Regarding claims 9-10 and 23-24, applicant teaches of a "paid sponsor" advertisement being displayed for a period of time after which a second "paid sponsor" advertisement would be displayed for another period of time. This is fundamentally what a dynamic advertisement (ie. multiple advertisements) system would entail. Loban et al. teaches of advertisements being displayed for a selected "time period" [claim 9, col 7, lines 6-10].

9. Regarding claims 8, 11, 22, and 25, applicant teaches of the specific type of advertisement that is to be displayed ("team logo" or "ticket sales"). Applicant admits that static backgrounds during press conferences currently display "team logos" amongst other things [section 0003]. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to use these static advertisements on a dynamic display during a press conference.

10. Regarding claims 2, 14, 17, and 28, applicant teaches of using a "split screen mode" to allow for two video signals to be displayed simultaneously. Loban et al. teaches of a billboard system with multiple video screens that are independent of each other [claim 19, col 8, lines 28-54]. These multiple video screens can be used to make the original advertisement bigger (tying the screens together) or to display multiple advertisements on the individual screens of the billboard. Loban et al.'s "split screen" is true split screen with two screens lined up lined up next to each other. Loban et al.'s split screen accomplishes the same task (two advertisements being displayed next to each other) that the applicant teaches. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to change Loban et al.'s two screen split screen to split screen that is done within one screen.

11. Regarding claims 15 and 29, applicant teaches of using a "mask member" to overlay the monitor housings in order to create a visually uninterrupted backdrop background. Applicant admits that it is common for the background to be "camera friendly" and to be setup with a variety of different materials being used [sec 0002]. Applicant teaches of a using a "mask member" in order to make the displays "visually interrupted" or camera friendly. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art using displays at press conferences to use mask members or other materials to make the background "camera friendly."

12. **Claims 5-7, 20-21, and 31-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicants Admitted Prior Art in view of Loban et al. (US5612741) in view of Carter (US5439043).** Applicant discusses that it is "common" for backdrops at press conferences to have "team or organizational logos" as well as "sponsor logos" [section 0003]. Applicant states that the problem with the current system is that they "are static and do not change during the course of an interview" [section 0002]. Loban et al. teaches of a video billboard that can be used to display messages of multiple advertisers that can be controlled electronically without having to be physically updated [abstract, background of the invention]. Loban et al. explains the difficulty of changing static advertisements [col 1, lines 10-15] and why dynamic advertisements solve this problem. Carter teaches of a display system that can be used during press conferences [background of the invention, lines 5-28].

Regarding claim 5 and 20, applicant teaches of disassembling the backdrop after a press conference has completed. Carter teaches assembly, disassembly and

transporting of the apparatus [background of the invention, lines 5-10] after a press conference. The assembly and disassembly of press conference apparatus as proposed by applicant is taught by Carter. Therefore it would have been obvious to assemble and disassemble Loban et al.'s system when being used at a press conference.

Regarding claims 6-7, 21, and 31-32, applicant teaches of packing the backdrop in a protective transport case. Carter teaches of assembly and reassembly of the apparatus. Official notice is taken that people have used protective containers and mobile carts when moving equipment. It would have been obvious to use a protective container to protect the apparatus and use a cart to move it.

13. Claims 13, 33-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicants admitted prior art in view of Loban et al. (US5612741) in further view of applicants admitted prior art.

Regarding claim 13, applicant teaches of "zooming in or zooming out" from a selected area of the video display. Applicant openly admits that commercially available video display screens currently achieve that function [detailed description, section 19]. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use that function with Loban et al.'s video billboard for press conferences.

Regarding claims 33 and 34, applicant describes using "at least two plasma display" screens. Applicant discloses commercially available plasma screens that are used to achieve this goal [detailed description, section 0019]. Applicant also discloses that other alternative components exist that can be readily used [detailed description,

section 0016]. It would be obvious to use plasma screens or any other video displaying technology that was commercially available to display the content. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art to use, amongst other things, plasma display screens.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Palani P. Rathinasamy whose telephone number is (571) 272-5906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5p.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eric Stamber can be reached on (571) 272-6724. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PPR

JEFFREY D. CARLSON
PRIMARY EXAMINER